REGISTER OF CLASSIFICATION DECISIONS

Date of entry in Register:		21 September 2000		
Name of applicant/court:		The District Court at Auckland	b	
Applicant to the Labelling Body:		Not Applicable		
Title of Publication:		Link		
Other Known Titles:		Not Stated		
Director:		Chi Chi LaRue		
Producer:		Dan Cross		
Publisher:		Not Applicable		
Author:		Not Applicable		
Format:		Video Recording VHS/PAL		
Country of Origin:		Not Stated		
Language:		English		
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	o o o o o o		• • • • • • • • •	
-		une u.	Dynamin a time .	447.04
	ink		Running time:	117.21
Trailers: All Worlds Vide All Worlds Vide			Running time:	0.27 0.16
			Total Running time:	118.04
Excision/Alteration: Not A		Applicable.		
Reason(s) for Excision	n:			
Not Applicable.				

Classification Decision:	
Objectionable.	
Display Conditions:	
Not Applicable.	
Descriptive Note:	
Not Applicable.	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Direction to issue a label has been given on:	Not Applicable.

SUMMARY OF THE REASONS FOR DECISION:

The video recording entitled *Link* is classified as: Objectionable.

The video recording is deemed objectionable under s3(2)(d) of the Films, Videos, and Publications Classification Act 1993 (FVPC Act) because it tends to promote and support the use of urine in association with sexual conduct. The primary focus of *Link* is the explicit depiction of sexual activity between men. The sexual activity depicted presents as consensual, and safe sexual practices are evident during penetrative sexual activity. There is a brief scene which depicts the use of urine in association with sexual conduct. The nature of this scene, and its inclusion in material which is intended to sexually arouse the viewer, means that *Link* tends to promote and support the use of urine in association with sexual conduct.

The New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (NZBR Act) has been considered in relation to this publication. As a deeming provision, s3(2) of the FVPC Act is evidence of Parliament's intention that publications to which those criteria apply should be banned. It is therefore not possible to give s3(2) an interpretation that is consistent with the freedom of expression contained in the NZBR Act. The classification of "objectionable" is the only restriction on the freedom of expression that is consistent with this intention that publications such as *Link* should be banned.

OFLC Ref: 1079